1695
tA43
1695
6/4

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

Mr. *HILL*'s BOOK,

ENTITULED,

A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, &c.

Peter Allix

20 + 17
(3) 65 (3) P
Fath. t. Hac. A.
374
394
391

Thos. Thorp cat 391

cloth, 6s [F.31] 1688

89 [**Allix** (Peter)] Animadversions on Mr. Hill's Book, entituled, "A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, against the Imputations of Gilbert [Burnet], Bishop of Sarum," (65 pp.), sm. 4to, *unbound*, 6s [G.2] 1695

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

Mr. *HILL*'s BOOK,

ENTITULED,

A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, againſt the Imputations of GILBERT, *Lord Biſhop of* Sarum.

In a Letter to a Perſon of Quality.

LONDON:
Printed for Ri. Chiſwell, at the *Roſe* and *Crown* in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard. 1695.

Princeton JUN 27 1928

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

Mr. HILL's BOOK,

INTITULED,

A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, against the Imputations of Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum.

In a Letter to a Person of Quality.

LONDON:
Printed for Mr. Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church Yard. 1695.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON Mr. *HILL's* BOOK, ENTITULED, *A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers*, &c.

SIR,

IN obedience to your Commands, I here send you my Thoughts upon Mr. *Hill's Book*; the whole of which consists of Four Heads. The *First* contains a Censure of what the Bishop compendiously supposes concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity. The *Second* Criticises upon what he says about the Mystery of the Incarnation. The *Third* is a Vindication of the Fathers, whom he thinks the Bishop has treated very ill, as to the Explication they have given of these Two Mysteries. The *Fourth* and last is an Explanation of the Mystery of

the Trinity, which he advances as much more agreeable to the Syſtem of Scripture, and of the Ancients, than the Biſhop's.

As to the firſt, Mr. *Hill* picks a Quarrel with the Biſhop, becauſe in ſpeaking of the Perſuaſions of *Socinians*, *Arians*, and *Orthodox*, concerning the Nature of Chriſt, he calls them three different *Opinions*. He would not have had the Biſhop uſe the word *Opinion*, in ſpeaking of that which we look upon as founded on Divine Revelation, and receive as the Object of our Faith. This doubtleſs is a moſt heinous Crime, which deſerved all Mr. *Hill*'s Exaggerations, tho *Gregory* of *Nazianzen* has uſed the ſame word, *Orat.* 35. Certainly, when an Author undertakes to conſider the principal Tenets touching the Nature of Jeſus Chriſt, namely, that of *Artemas*, that of *Arius*, and that of the *Church*; he may, I think, without a Crime, call them three *Opinions*; eſpecially, as the Biſhop has done, before he had proved any thing by Revelation. Every body knows that ſtrong Expreſſions are not to be uſed in the ſtating of a queſtion, but only after the matter has been well proved. So that a Criticiſm of this Nature, gives us no great Character of the Author.

With as much ſincerity does Mr. *Hill* endeavour to bring under ſuſpicion the Biſhop's Expreſſions, becauſe he does not diſtinctly ſay, whether the *Socinian* or *Arian* Opinions, have been within or without the Church. "For, ſays he, *page* 2. "if the Biſhop ſuppoſes that theſe Opinions have "been within the Church: Then indeed here is an "Inſinuation laid for the Communion with *Socinians*,

which

"which is a bleſſed comprehenſion. This he repeats or inſinuates again ſomewhere elſe. If a *Pagan* had made this Reflection againſt a Biſhop, he might have been charged with want of Candour. But what can we ſay, when theſe words come from the Mouth of a Prieſt, againſt a Biſhop, of the Church of *England?* And what means Mr. *Hill*, when he finds fault with the Notion of Faith given by the Biſhop; to wit, that we believe Points of Doctrine, becauſe we are perſuaded that they are revealed in Scripture? Does it follow from thence, as Mr. *Hill* ſuppoſes, p. 6. *That Faith reſolves it ſelf into each private Man's Opinion?* Which indeed has occaſioned all the Hereſies and Diviſions that have been in the Church.

This Cenſure has ſomewhat ſo ſingular in it, that it well deſerves to be taken notice of; and I promiſe you to remember it, and to ſhew you that the Author eſpouſes a Principle as dangerous as any in Point of Religion. But I muſt not do this at preſent, for it would lead us out of our way, and bring us off from the Article of the Trinity, which we have now chiefly in view.

Mr. *Hill* pretends that the Biſhop does not explain himſelf clearly upon this Myſtery. Theſe are his ſurmiſes. The Biſhop has not diſtinctly ſet down that there are Three Perſons: and every Biſhop, who does not expreſs himſelf by the word *Perſon*, which is received in this matter, gives a right to any one to ſay, that he denies the Trinity; whereas this at moſt were but *Sabellianiſm*. Upon this unjuſt foundation he takes occaſion,

ſion to divert his Reader, borrowing for that purpoſe the witty Conceit of the *Socinian* Author of a little Book, Entituled, *The Doctrine of the Trinity ſet in its True Light*, p. 40. *&c.* For, *p.* 19. he brings in a Catechumen, who deſires to know of the Biſhop what he underſtands by the Three of the Trinity; and ſeeing that the Biſhop avoids the word *Perſon*, he laughs at the Inſtruction which the Biſhop gives him, and leaves him to ſeek ſome comfort in the Doctrine of the Philoſophers. I am ſurprized that Mr. *Hill* gives himſelf ſo much trouble to prove, that the word *Perſon* occurs in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and in *Tertullian*, ſince he ſhews himſelf, that the Biſhop believes as much as he does upon this Article, *p.* 17. The Biſhop had expreſſed himſelf very clearly upon the matter, *p.* 97. Theſe are his words, "This is the Doctrine that I intend now "to explain to you: I do not mean that I will "pretend to tell you how this is to be under-"ſtood, and in what reſpect theſe Perſons are be-"lieved to be One, and in what reſpects they are "Three.

But Mr. *Hill* was reſolved to give his Suſpicions a full ſcope, and he would rather rob the Biſhop of this Confeſſion, than do him Juſtice by acknowledging the truth. All this ſavours very much of a Spirit of Diſputation, and argues but little ſincerity. But after all, it may be asked, why has not the Biſhop made uſe every where of the word *Perſon*, which is conſecrated by ſo long a Cuſtom in the Church, and why does he more frequently ſay the Bleſſed Three? Any body elſe, but

but Mr. *Hill* would eaſily have apprehended the reaſon of it. The nature of the diſpute with *Arians* and *Socinians*, who will have us ſtick to the words of Scripture, requires that we ſhould expreſs the truths of Chriſtianity in Scripture words, if we would have them to be received. If we at firſt daſh mingle with them words which they look upon as foreign, and which need to be ſoftned, to give them a ſenſe free from abſurdity in the matter of the Trinity; this ſerves only to render the Diſpute intricate, whereas we ſhould aim at the convincing of them by that principle which they acknowledge, namely the Authority of the Scripture.

But there is ſomething more to be ſaid for the Biſhop. In all likelihood he would not engage himſelf in the Method of thoſe, who to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity againſt the *Socinians*, ſeem to have given them great Advantages by laying down Principles, from which it is to be feared occaſion may be taken, to impute *Tritheiſm* to the Defenders of the Trinity. This inconvenience may be avoided by reducing the diſpute to the terms of Scripture, which cannot ſo eaſily be done, when we employ ſuch words as are made uſe of by the *Socinians* againſt the *Orthodox*, to prove them guilty of *Tritheiſm*, which is juſtly look'd upon as the overthrowing of the whole Article of the Trinity.

The Biſhop therefore, who himſelf uſes the word *Perſon* where he has occaſion for it, could have no manner of deſign to condemn that word, tho ſometimes he abſtained from it; he only leaves it out of

the Diſpute, that he might not involve himſelf into an unneceſſary Conteſt with relation to a *Socinian*. He has exactly kept himſelf to the terms of Scripture, which he thinks are preciſe enough to convince an *Arian*, or a *Socinian*. I am perſwaded, That if Mr. *Hill* had been to handle this Subject with the ſame views, he would have done as the Biſhop, and that no Biſhop would have cenſured him for it. But Mr. *Hill* was reſolved right or wrong, to appear in Publick againſt his Lordſhip.

Mr. *Hill* comes on with a new Charge, and endeavours to faſten a ſuſpicion upon the Biſhop, as if he did not believe the perſonality of the λόγος before the Incarnation. The Biſhop ſays, That the word *Perſon* was adopted, chiefly, in oppoſito the *Patripaſſians*. This does not ſatisfy Mr. *Hill*, he labours to prove that *Praxeas* was the firſt Author of that Hereſy; and he ſhews by St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, that the word *Perſon* was in uſe before *Praxeas*'s time. 'Tis not very material, and yet no Digreſſion, to ſhew that Mr. *Hill* is miſtaken about the Antiquity of the *Patripaſſians*). *Simon Magus* was the Author of that Sect, above 160 before *Praxeas*. At leaſt, this is what we are told by *Irenaus*, St. *Auguſtin*, and *Theodoret*. *Vid. Cout. in lib. Conſtit. p.* 285. Neither is it certain, that *Heb.* 1. 2. *Character Hypoſtaſeos* muſt be rendred by *Perſon*; the Vulgar has rendred it by *Subſtance*, as well as *Chap.* XI. And the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* have taken the word *Hypoſtaſis* in the *Creed*, for *Eſſence* or *Subſtance*. Thoſe who were at the Council of *Alexandria*, in the year 362. took it in the ſame

ſame ſenſe; and St. *Jerom* underſtood it ſo, *Ep.* 57. However, ſays Mr. *Hill*, the Biſhop has not given to the *Word* the true Notion of a *Perſon*; beſides that he has avoided that Expreſſion in ſpeaking of it. The Biſhop only acknowledges, That the Father, the *Word*, and the Spirit have a particular diſtinction from one another, by which every one of them differs from another; and tho Mr. *Hill* cites the Biſhop's words, who affirms, That in the Eſſence of God there are Three which are really different from each other, and which differ from one another more than three Names, or three Economies, *ad extra*, or three Modes; yet he is not pleaſed with the Biſhop's Notion, but he muſt needs be a *Sabellian*. This Judgment is made too raſhly. The Biſhop ſays, That the word *Perſon* muſt not be underſtood in the matter of the Trinity, as we ordinarily do in relation to Creatures, *a compleat Intelligent Being*. And does this offend Mr. *Hill?* For my part, I can ſee no harm in it. The Biſhop has of his ſide all the Sober Divines, who have conſidered the Doctrine of the Trinity with ſome attention: For there is that difference betwixt the Perſons of the Trinity, and Perſons among Creatures, to which the Definition of a *Perſon*, rejected by the Biſhop, does belong; that if that Definition were admitted into the Trinity, it would import the Multiplication of the Eſſence, as well as the Multiplication of the Perſons, which is juſtly to be abhorred by all Divines. After all, if the Biſhop has not determined the nature and degree of the preciſe diſtinction which is betwixt the Three Perſons, but has adhered

in this matter, to what the Scripture teaches, he ought to be commended for his Modeſty, inſtead of being reproached for not having explained that which all prudent Divines own cannot be explained. Mr. *Hill* himſelf knows well enough, that one cannot explain theſe differences, without either falling into difficulties, out of which he can't extricate himſelf, or aſſerting Contradictions which do much more weaken than illuſtrate and confirm the belief of this Myſtery.

Theſe are Mr. *Hill*'s chief Accuſations upon the Article of the Trinity. He has not been willing to conſider, as any equitable Man would have done, that the Biſhop did not deſign to write a Treatiſe upon the Trinity, which would have obliged him to handle this Subject in another manner, but that he glances only upon what muſt be ſaid in general, to be underſtood, in order to his treating of the Divinity of Chriſt, which is the only Subject-matter of his Diſcourſe. And ſince he briefly lays down the Article of the Trinity as a foundation to explain that of the Incarnation, thoſe who after this can charge him with not believing the Trinity, becauſe he does not treat that matter in its full extent, muſt either be very malicious, or very defective in their Judgments.

Let us come now to the point of the Incarnation. After that Mr. *Hill* has ſuppoſed, contrary to all truth, that the Biſhop does not believe Three Perſons in the Trinity, he downright charges him with denying the Perſonality of the *Word*, and acknowledging the Perſonality of the Meſſias no other

other way, than as the Perſonality of Jeſus Chriſt did reſult only from the Union of his Two Natures. Then he gives himſelf a great deal of trouble to confute his own Whimſy. But I need only remember him of the forecited words of the Biſhop, to ſhew him how unfairly he deals in this matter. He does not act more honeſtly, when he wiredraws this Expreſſion of the Biſhop, *That Divine Perſon in whom dwelt the Eternal Word*, to prove that he acknowledges no Perſonality, but in the Humane Nature of Chriſt; Eſpecially, ſays he, becauſe the Biſhop has not exploded the Imagination of thoſe, who conceive that the Character of *Son of God* has its foundation in the Humanity which the *Word* has aſſumed. The Biſhop has rejected this Notion as a falſe Doctrine, tho he has not refuted it *ex profeſſo*, his Subject leading him to ſomething that was more material. But might not he ſpeak in the ſame ſtrain with all thoſe, who ſpeak of the Human Nature of Jeſus Chriſt? None elſe but Mr. *Hill* would have taken it amiſs. He muſt be ſtrangely given up to his Suſpicions, to conceive and publiſh ſuch as theſe againſt the Biſhop upon ſuch ſlight and poor Arguments. And does not Mr. *Hill* deſerve to be admired, when having criticized upon theſe words of the Biſhop, he obſerves, That ſince the Biſhop does not tell us, whether the Father, and the Spirit did enter into the Perſonality, which reſulted from the Union of the Two Natures, or not, but only that God and Man are become One Perſon, he has left a Door open for many Hereſies upon this Myſtery. One had need have much patience

patience to follow an Author ſo fruitful in vain Conceits. He quotes theſe words of the Biſhop, that the *Word* dwelt in Fleſh; and yet he is angry becauſe the Biſhop ſays elſewhere, that God and Man are become one Perſon; as if under the general name of God, the Biſhop would leave his Reader to think that he underſtands the Father and the Spirit as well as the Word. At this rate when we ſay that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, we leave the Hearer in ſuſpenſe, whether we mean that he is only the Son of the Father, or likewiſe the Son of the Holy Ghoſt. When a Man reaſons thus in a matter of ſo great moment, one would think he deſigns nothing elſe but to be laughed at, or to be read with indignation.

He goes on to the Divinity of the Meſſias, upon which he raiſes new Accuſations againſt the Biſhop; though he confeſſes *p.* 45. That the Biſhop has advanced many Good and Orthodox Truths upon this Article. This being the main thing intended by the Biſhop, it will not be improper to give you a ſhort account of it, that you may judge the better of the Juſtice of Mr. *Hill*'s Accuſations. Firſt of all the Biſhop gives an Idea of the dwelling of the *Word* in Fleſh; and he explains in a very intelligible manner, what's called in School-terms the *Hypoſtatical Union*; then he goes on to ſhew whence this Phraſe of Inhabitation, or *Shekina* is borrowed, namely, from the Divine Preſence, granted to the *Jews* in the Cloud of Glory which was over the Tabernacle. He very exactly obſerves, That the God of the *Jews* is called *Jehovah*, a word which the Seventy have rendred conſtantly by

by that of Κύριος, and that the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles aſcribe conſtantly that word to Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe of the indwelling of the *Word*; ſo that when the Apoſtles have propoſed Jeſus Chriſt as the true Object of the Adoration of Chriſtians, they did not change the Object of Adoration received among the *Jews*, ſince it was the ſame *Jehovah* who inhabited before the Cloud of Glory, that now dwelt in Fleſh, in an inſeparable manner, which is to continue for ever. This is a ſhort abſtract of what the Biſhop explains at large, and with ſeveral reflections upon divers Texts of Scripture, *p.* 120. His words are; "In "oppoſition to all which, we Chriſtians own but "one ſupreme God, and we do alſo believe that "this great God is alſo our federal God, or *Jeho-* "*vah*, by his dwelling in the Human Nature of "Jeſus Chriſt; ſo that he is our Lord not by an "aſſumption into high Dignity, or the commu- "nicating divine Honour to him, but as the Eternal "Word dwelt bodily in him: And thus he is our "Lord, not as a Being diſtinct from, or deputed by "the great God, but as the great God manifeſting "himſelf in his Fleſh or human Nature; which "is the great Myſtery of Godlineſs, or of true "Religion: And this will give a clear account of "all thoſe other paſſages of the New Teſtament, "in which the Lord Jeſus is mentioned, as diſtinct "from, and ſubordinate to God and his Father. The "one is the more extended Notion of God, as the "Maker and Preſerver of all things; and the "other is the more ſpecial Notion, as appropria-

"ted

" ted to Chriſtians, by which God is federally their " God, Lord, or *Jehovah*.

Certainly a Man muſt have a ſmall ſtock of Modeſty or Sincerity, who having read this Explication, can charge a Prelate with Socinianiſm, or Neſtorianiſm. And thus he goes about to prove his accuſation. He takes notice of an Expreſſion of the Biſhop's, *p.* 25. We believe, ſays the Biſhop, That Chriſt was God by vertue of the indwelling of the eternal *Word* in him; the *Jews* could make no Objection to this, who knew that their Fathers had worſhipped the Cloud of Glory, becauſe of God's reſting upon it. It is a fine thing to ſee how gravely Mr. *Hill* ſnaps up this Expreſſion of the *Jews* worſhipping the *Shekina*: Here he makes a pompous ſhew of needleſs Remarks, to convince the Biſhop that God and the Cloud were two different things; and that the *Jews* never worſhipped the Cloud of Glory, becauſe otherwiſe they had been Idolaters. And all this, becauſe the Biſhop has taken the *Shekina*, for God dwelling in the Cloud. I confeſs that Expreſſion is not altogether exact; but a candid Reader would eaſily have underſtood it by ſo many other Expreſſions which the Biſhop employs in ſpeaking upon this Subject, where he ſhews the difference which he makes between God and the Cloud of Glory. No body has found fault with Dr. *Teniſon* for taking the *Shekina* for the ſecond Perſon, (of Idolatry *p.* 319.) theſe are his words; " Accordingly " when God is ſaid in the Old Teſtament to have " appeared, they ſeem to miſtake, who aſcribe it " to

"to an Angel personating God, and not to the "second Person, as the *Shekina* (or as *Tertullian* "calleth him) the representator of the Father. "The same Expression occurs *p.* 380. of the same "Book. And yet Dr. *Tenison* has not been accused hitherto of confounding the Habitation, with the λόγος that dwelt in the Cloud. Dr. *Whitby* says as much as Dr. *Tenison*, and Mr. *Hill* does not take it ill. He has read *Tertullian's* Book against *Praxeas*, but he seems not to have understood that Maxim in it. —— *Malo te ad sensum rei, quam ad sonum vocabuli exerceas*; at least he does not practise it much in respect to the Bishop; especially since he owns, *p.* 27. that the Bishop has corrected that Expression. But Mr. *Hill* does not only attack this Expression, which though in it self it may be somewhat improper, is yet usual enough; but he falls upon the whole Argument of the Bishop; and to overthrow it, he denies in the first place what the Bishop advances, That the word *Jehovah* has been always applied to the Divinity dwelling in the Cloud of Glory. Secondly, Though this were granted, he denies, That the Divinity of the Messias can be inferred from *Jehovah's* dwelling bodily in him, as the Bishop would have it. And he does not believe that St. *Paul*, *Col.* 2. has furnished the Bishop with a notion of the Divinity's dwelling in Jesus Christ, sufficient to ground Adoration upon. Lastly, He accuses the Bishop of not having fully answered a difficulty which he proposes to himself from 1 *Cor.* 8. which seems to appropriate the name κύριος, or *Jehovah*, to the Son exclusively of the Father; and he gives

us another Solution which he thinks is better. We ſhall reſume every one of theſe Heads in their order. And,

I. Mr. *Hill* denies that the word *Jehovah* is always aſcribed to God, with relation to this Habitation in the Cloud. What tho the Biſhop had been ſomewhat too poſitive concerning the word *Jehovah*, in aſſerting that it always refers to the Habitation in the Cloud? Here were after all no great harm, ſince Mr. *Hill* himſelf owns that he is called ſo where ſpoken of as in Covenant with the *Jews*. A little Candor and Common Senſe would have prompted an Ingenuous Reader to make that Reſtriction of the Biſhop's words; but in vain ſhould the Biſhop look for ſo much Equity from Mr. *Hill*, who diſputes for diſputing's ſake. Divines of a greater Name than Mr. *Hill*, laugh at thoſe Remarks which he has accumulated. Dr. *Teniſon* has proved, That the *Shekina* is celebrated down from *Adam* to *Noah*, from *Noah* to *Moſes*, from *Moſes* to the Captivity, and from the Captivity to the *Meſſias*. This is in his Book of Idolatry, where one would think he intended a Refutation of Mr. *Hill*. After all, whatever the meaning of the word *Jehovah* may have been before the Law, it's certain, as I ſaid, That under the Law that word denoted the God which the *Jews* worſhipped in the Cloud of Glory, and that it is with reſpect to that Habitation that St. *John* ſays, ſpeaking of his Incarnation, That the Word has dwelt amongſt us. The Biſhop, who intends to prove that the Apoſtles did not propoſe another Ob-

ject

ject of Adoration, than the *Jehovah* worshipped under the Law, desires no more than this, which is sufficient for his purpose.

But can we rationally infer the Adoration of the Messias from this, that the fulness of the Godhead dwells in him bodily, as St. *Paul* tells us? *Col.* 2. The Orthodox have believed it to this day, and the Bishop with them; but out of spight to the Bishop, Mr. *Hill* will not allow this to be a good consequence; he does not much concern himself, whether the *Socinians* triumph or not, provided he may quarrel with the Bishop, by alledging I know not what frivolous Exceptions, of which himself would have been ashamed, had he not been transported with his Passion. To take this passage from the Bishop which seems so full to his purpose, Mr. *Hill* gives it so Chimerical an Interpretation, that probably he is the first Inventor of it; he pretends that the Apostle speaks there in opposition to the *Gnosticks* Notions, who excluded Jesus Christ from the Supreme πλήρωμα or Divinity; but that tho St. *Paul* had declared *Jehovah* to be in Jesus Christ, yet of what sort of inexistence soever this might be understood, it could not be concluded from it, that the Messias was to be adored. I am not of Mr. *Hill*'s mind concerning the sense he gives to the word πλήρωμα in that place of St. *Paul*. 'Tis not very probable that this Apostle had an eye to the *Gnosticks*, and it is much more natural to understand this fulness in opposition to the Manifestations of the Deity under the *Old Testament*; the Sequel of the Discourse seems to lead us thither, since the Apo-

ſtle declares that it dwelt bodily, which is oppoſed to Figures. בעצם is the word which the Apoſtle has expreſſed by σωματικῶς, which ſignifies really and ſubſtantially. But be this as it will, what can Mr. *Hill* mean, when he denies that from ſuch an Habitation as this, by which the Fleſh is perſonally united to the Deity, the Adoration of the Meſſias cannot be inferred? It's plain, that the Biſhop does not pretend that the Fleſh ought to be adored in the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt; but it is yet more certain, that no Chriſtrian, except thoſe that deny the Hypoſtatical Union of both Natures, denies that the word incarnate is to be adored, that is, the Meſſias, who is God and Man. They all agree, That the Principle of *Adorability*, or that for which the Perſon of the Meſſias is to be adored, is the Divinity of the Word; but they don't deny, as Mr. *Hill* ſeems to do, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Object of Adoration, becauſe the indwelling of the Word is ſuch, that thereby the Human and Divine Natures are united in one Perſonality.

Here is another Criticiſm of Mr. *Hill*'s. He owns, That the Argument which the Biſhop draws from the word κύριος, that is conſtantly given to Jeſus Chriſt in the *New*, and anſwers to that of *Jehovah* in the *Old Teſtament*, is an excellent Argument, but he thinks the Biſhop had not skill enough to free it from an Objection ariſing from 1 *Cor.* 8. The *Arians* have inſiſted upon that place, Verſe 6. *Nobis tamen unus Deus pater*, to prove that the Son was not God. They have been anſwered, That when the Father is named here, the

the Son is also evidently supposed, as having the Divine Nature, if he be truly the Son of God. It has been often said to them, that by the same reason we might conclude, That the Father is not *Dominus*, because the Apostle adds, *& unus Dominus Jesus Christus per quem omnia*; and wherein has the Bishop enervated this Argument? Because the Bishop affirms (says Mr. *Hill*) that the word κύριος answering to that of *Jehovah* in the Seventy Translation, is here appropriated to Jesus Christ, which he establishes as a consequence of his Hypothesis, that the word κύριος is a federal Title of God, with relation to the *Jews*. Now Mr. *Hill* thinks that's a false Hypothesis: On the other hand he pretends, That the word κύριος is opposed to that of κυρίοι by St. *Paul*, which cannot be rendred by *Jehovæ* in the Plural Number; from whence he concludes, That the Bishop has not taken off the Objection he makes to himself. The question started by Mr. *Hill*, whether the word κύριος expresses that of *Jehovah*; and whether supposing it expresses the *Jehovah* of the *Old Testament*, it is a federal word with respect to the *Jews*; this question, I say, is decided in favour of the Bishop, not only by the Moderns, but also by the Ancients. If Mr. *Hill* has a mind to be informed of the Opinion of the Ancients in this matmatter, let him read *Origen* upon the 8th of *Ezekiel*, *p.* 1. and St. *Jerom* upon the same at the beginning of his 9th Book; he may read also the Learned *Pearson* upon the Creed, as to the second thing controverted here between the Bishop and him. The foundation of this Opinion is more

solid

ſolid than Mr. *Hill* is aware of; almoſt all the Ancients prove the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe it was he who appeared under the *Old Teſtament*; and that he who then appeared is named *Jehovah*, which the Seventy render by κύριος. Therefore the Apoſtle might ſay, according to this Phraſeology, that if the Chriſtians did acknowledge but one God, they acknowledge likewiſe but one Lord, *viz.* Jeſus Chriſt; giving to the λόγος the Title of *Jehovah*, which is rendred by κύριος in the *Old Teſtament*. So that it is St. *Paul*'s Doctrine, that the λόγος is *Jehovah*, and that the λόγος Incarnate is no leſs *Jehovah* than he was before the Incarnation. If it were otherwiſe, St. *Paul* had argued like a Sophiſter, when he proves by a paſſage out of *Joel*, that Salvation belongs to Chriſtians, becauſe they invoke Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Lord ſpoken of in *Joel*, *Rom.* 10.

I know not why Mr. *Hill* is not ſatisfied with this Solution; 'tis his fault, and not the Biſhop's: For whoever aſſerts that St. *Paul* finds the Fountain of the Diety in the Father, by reaſon of which he calls the Father the only God, and whoever maintains that the Son is the ſecond Perſon, who is called κύριος by the *Jews*, and by whom God has acted all along during that Oeconomy, leaves no force at all to the Objections of *Arians* or *Socinians*.

Laſtly, Mr. *Hill* rejects the Argument for our Saviour's Divinity, which the Biſhop draws from this; that we don't read either in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, or in their *Epiſtles*, that ever the *Jews*

did object to *Christians* that they were guilty of Idolatry; this Argument seems to him false and impertinet. 'Tis strange how men are sometimes blinded by Passion, and carried away with the eagerness of Disputing! The Bishop does not argue here against all sorts of men, but only against the *Socinians*, who maintain that Jesus Christ was exalted to the Title of God after his Ascension. It's certain, that in this case the silence of the *Jews* is a very strange thing, for they would not have failed to object against Christians, that their Religion did propose a new Divinity, altogether unkown under the Law. On the other hand, if this objection was ever made against the Christians, 'tis very strange likewise, that the Apostles should no where obviate the Scandal which the *Jews* might so justly have taken at that new object of Religious Worship, which they proposed. I don't know how Mr. *Hill* is made, but I am sure that a *Socinian* could never make use of those Answers which he furnishes him with: At least, if I remember well, the *Socinian* who has Answered his Lordship, has thought fitter to say nothing upon this Argument of the Bishop, than to have recourse to Mr. *Hill*'s Solutions, which he has not judged to be a solid and sufficient Answer to this Observation of the Bishop.

Mr. *Hill* having thus censured what the Bishop says concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation, one would have thought that he was going to enter upon the Examination of those Censures which the Bishop has made of the Fathers in general; but he returns to the Doctrine of the Trinity,

nity, and accuſes the Biſhop of having ſuppreſſed the Notions which diſtinguiſh the Perſons; *viz.* Generation and Proceſſion.

This Accuſation is as unjuſt and as ill grounded as all the reſt; for the Biſhop ſays enough of that Matter, *p.* 132, 133, and 134. He ſhould have conſidered, that ſince the Biſhop did not undertake a Treatiſe concerning the Trinity, he was not bound to examine the whole Dogma; it was enough for his purpoſe to mention only what he thought moſt fit to eſtabliſh the Divinity of Chriſt, that he intended to prove againſt the *Socinians*. Beſides, Mr. *Hill* ought to have done the Biſhop the Juſtice to believe, that he does no leſs include in the Myſtery (which he does not pretend to explain for fear of deſtroying the nature of it) thoſe Notions which diſtinguiſh the Perſons, than the Dogma it ſelf. And indeed, though theſe Notions which the Biſhop owns to be ſo real, as to produce a real and numerical diſtinction betwixt the Perſons, are uſed by us in ſpeaking of the Trinity, Mr. *Hill* cannot be ignorant that they are no leſs Myſterious and Difficult to be explained than the Dogma it ſelf. We underſtand what made Mr. *Hill* return to this Subject; he had a mind to bring in queſtion the Biſhop's believing of the Trinity, becauſe he ſays in a Letter to Mr. *Boyle*, that in many ancient Manuſcripts he has not found that celebrated place of St. *John*, *There are three*, &c. Here he oppoſes to the Biſhop an Author who takes this place for Genuine; this is no great piece of Cunning. For neither the Biſhop, nor the other learned men, who

who compare the Manuſcripts upon controverted places, do thereby give the Hereticks any advantage. Dr. *Fell*, the late Biſhop of *Oxford*, who took ſo much pains in this kind of Literature, would have thanked the Biſhop of *Sarisbury* for his Diſcovery: For that great Man judged of things otherways, and by more elevated Principles than Mr. *Hill*. I am ſure Dr. *Mills* will make uſe of the Biſhop's Obſervation, and do him that Juſtice which the Biſhop of *Oxford* would have done, if he had executed his Deſign. But this keeps me from the main Subject.

Let us ſee at laſt what Mr. *Hill* cenſures in the Biſhop, concerning his pretended ill uſage of the Fathers, *p.* 51. He taxes the Fathers, ſays Mr. *Hill*, "for no real Obliquities, but their Ca-"tholick Principles; fixes on them ſuch Theories "as they never dreamed of, and ſuch as are de-"ſtructive of their own avowed Faith; and this "without quoting ſo much as one paſſage out of "them; he gives them not ſo much as one good "word, but finally preſents them to us as a parcel "of impertinent and ſelf-contradictory Babblers. Here is the Charge, and the Proof follows, *p.* 54. In this, ſays the Biſhop, *i. e.* in their teaching the Reſpects and Modes of this Unity and Diſtinction, too many both Ancients and Moderns have, perhaps, gone beyond bounds, while ſome were pleaſed with the Platonical Notions of Emanations, and Fecundity in the Divine Eſſence. The Biſhop, you ſee, uſes the words *perhaps* and *too many*, he does not ſay all; which does mightily

mitigate his Aſſertion. And yet Mr. *Hill* is pleaſed to ſay, That he reflects upon the whole Ancient Church before and after the Council of *Nice*: This is not very ſincere. But granting the Biſhop had ſpoken ſo generally as Mr. *Hill* imputes it to him, yet he had ſaid nothing upon this Matter, but what many learned men of both Communions have advanced. Mr. *Hill* ſays, That we may very well aſcribe Platonical Notions to *Arius*, ſince *Petavius* avers that *Arius* was a Platoniſt; but not to the Fathers who have diſputed againſt *Arius*. This matter of Fact is not ſo certain as Mr. *Hill* thinks. Doctor *Cudworth* pretends that *Petavius* is miſtaken, and that *Athanaſius* and the Fathers of *Nice* were much greater Platoniſts than *Arius*. But without entring upon that Queſtion, it's undeniably true that the Fathers have made uſe of *Plato*'s Authority to explain the Myſtery of the Trinity. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, and *Euſebius Cæſarienſis*, have done it before the Council of *Nice*; and St. *Cyril* does the ſame after them againſt *Julian*. And yet Mr. *Hill* comes and tells us poſitively, that the Fathers were not Platoniſts, becauſe *Petavius* ſays that *Arius* was a Platoniſt. *Petavius* acknowledges that *Plato*'s Trinity does very widely differ from the Chriſtian Trinity. Doctor *Teniſon* ſays the ſame, and proves it with great Exactneſs and Learning (of Idolatry, *p.* 77, 78, and *p.* 139.) And after this, Is it a Crime for the Biſhop of *Salisbury* to reject thoſe Platonical Notions of the Trinity?

Juſtin. M. Ap. 2. p. 93. B. C.

But

But after all, ſays Mr. *Hill*, The Doctrine of Emanations is derived from the School of the *Jews* before Jeſus Chriſt, and applied by the Fathers to the Doctrine of the Trinity; and the Biſhop ought not to have ſuppoſed that ſome of the Ancients did reject them, while they were admitted by others. This Accuſation may be refuted in a word. The Biſhop himſelf admits of Emanations, as giving us the propereſt Idea to expreſs what we conceive of the Trinity; but he rejects the Platonical Emanations, which have no manner of Conformity with the Trinity of Chriſtians, although many Ancients and Moderns have adopted them, as all the learned do acknowledge.

I ſhall make the ſame Anſwer concerning Fecundity, whereof Mr. *Hill* thinks the Biſhop has avoided the Notion in explaining the Trinity. Mr. *Hill* grows ſo exceeding warm upon this Point, That he pronounces *Anathema* againſt the Biſhop if he does not acknowledge it. But why ſo much Noiſe? The Biſhop employs his Diſcourſe in proving the Divinity of the λόγος, to whom the Father has communicated the Divine Nature; this is what we call Eternal Generation: So that he can't be ſaid abſolutely to deny the Fecundity of the Divine Nature, which conſiſts in that it is communicated to ſeveral perſons. But he does not believe Fecundity, according to the common Notion implied in that word, and which ſeems to import that the Son muſt beget as well as the Father, having the ſame Nature in himſelf; and if he denys this Fecundity, with

relation to the Holy Ghoſt, Muſt he be therefore ſtruck with *Anathema*?

This word Fecundity may be uſed in a good Senſe, in ſpeaking of the Generation of the Son, which is the communication of the Divine Nature by the Father to the Son; but I queſtion whether it may be uſed with reſpect to the Emanation of the Holy Ghoſt, *a Patre & a Filio*; this Emanation is never called Generation in Scripture, the Language whereof ſhould be our Rule in ſpeaking of this Myſtery; and whatever ſome Divines may have thought, it is more prudent to abſtain from it. The Nominals maintain that it is as true to ſay, *Deus non generat*, which is true in regard of the Son, as to ſay, *Deus generat*, which is true of the Father. I would fain know Mr. *Hill*'s Opinion about this Propoſition, *Voluntas genuit voluntatem, ut ſapientia genuit ſapientiam.* I am perſuaded he would not like it, though it is certainly true that *Athanaſius* and St. *Auguſtin* have carried thus far the Notion of Fecundity.

Mr. *Hill* fancies to Nonplus the Biſhop, when he charges him with aſcribing to the Fathers ſuch Notions as were altogether Heatheniſh, and even ſaying, that they introduced them into the *Nicene* Creed, which has, *Lumen de lumine*, ſpeaking of the *Eternal Word.* Theſe are the Biſhop's words, *p.* 61. "For we have footſteps of a Tra-"dition, as Ancient as any we can trace up, "which limited the Emanations to Three. And "theſe thought there was a production, or rather

"an

"an Eduction of two out of the first, in the "same manner that some Philosophers thought "that Souls were propagated from Souls; and "the Figure by which this was explained, being "that of one Candle being lighted at another, "this seems to have given the rise to those words "*Light of Light.* It is certain that many of the "Fathers fell often into this conceit, *&c.* From these words Mr. *Hill* concludes, *First*, That the Fathers, according to the Bishop, have borrowed their Notion of the Three Emanations, from that of the Philosophers touching the Propagation of Souls, namely, the Notion of the Original of Souls *ex traduce*. *Secondly*, He pretends that the Fathers did never use that simile of two Candles, whereof one is lighted by the other. *Thirdly*, He charges him with fixing a Platonick, *i. e.* a Pagan Notion upon that *Nicene* Article, *Light of Light*. All this *Criticism*, which takes up about thirty Pages, may be reduced to nothing in a few words.

And, *First*, nothing is more certain, than that *Tatian*, *Justin Martyr*'s Disciple, has the Similitude of a Torch or Candle lighting another. "*Cum* "*voluit Deus*, says he, p. 145. *verbum ex ejus sim-* "*plicitate prosilicit, & verbum non inaniter prolatum,* "*primogenitum opus sit ipsius spiritus. Hoc scimus* "*autem esse principium Mundi, Natum est autem,* "*non per divisionem, non per avulsionem; quemadmo-* "*dum enim ab una face permultæ accenduntur, nec* "*tamen prima facis lux minuitur*, &c. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀπὸ μιᾶς δαδὸς ἀναπτόμενα πολλὰ, ἡ ἐξ πρώτης δαδὸς

δαδὸς διὰ τὴν ἔξαψιν τῶν πολλῶν δαδῶν οὐκ ἐλαττοῦσθαι τὸ φῶς, οὕτω καὶ ὁ λόγος προφητῶν οὐκ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ δυνάμεως, οὐκ ἄλογον πεποίηκε τὸ γεγενημένον, p. 145. B. and this Similitude they ſeem to have borrowed from *Philo*, who ſpeaking of the Spirit imparted from *Moſes* to the Seventy Elders, ſaith this was not done, κατ' ἀποκοπὴν, by Abſciſſion, but as Fire is lighted from Fire, or one Taper from another, without Diminution of its light, ἄλλ οἷα γένοιτο ἂν ἀπὸ πυρὸς ὁ καὶ μυρίας δαδας ἐξάψῃ μένει μηδ' ὁτιοῦν ἐλαττούμενον ἐν ὁμοίῳ; or at leaſt, from his Maſter *Juſtin*, who ſaith, that in Explication of this matter he uſed this Example, rather than that of the Light of the Sun. 'Tis plain, That the Fathers have built on this bottom, when they made uſe of the Similitude of the Sun, and its Beams. *Secondly*, The Biſhop might have proved very well by the Teſtimonies of *Juſtin* and *Tatian*, that the Ancients had not a very juſt Idea of the Doctrine of the Trinity, when they conceived two Generations of the *Word*; the one *ab æterno*; the other before the Creation of the World; the one by which the *Word* is only as *in potentia*, in the Father; the other by which he is actually produced by the Will of the Father, *cum voluit Deus*, ſays *Tatian*, p. 145. This Syſtem was alſo followed by *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, and *Athenagoras*. This is but a light Error in thoſe Ancients, if we believe Mr. *Hill*, who ſays, That this Syſtem was never condemned in the Church, tho it was never made or eſteemed a neceſſary Point of Faith or Doctrine, *p.* 75.

Lib. de ſignal. p. 223. F.

Dial. cum Tryph. p. 358. B. C. D.

Athenagoras Theophilus. Clemens Alexandrinus Tertullian & Lactantius.

What

What a bustle would Mr. *Hill* have kept, if the Bishop had advanced the like Proposition? I'm afraid a Judicious Reader will be tempted to think, when he sees this severity of Mr. *Hill* towards the Bishop, and his great Indulgence to the Ancients, that he has two Weights and two Measures. For after all, the Bishop's reasons to reject the System of the Ancients, are much more solid than those by which Mr. *Hill* endavours to soften and excuse it. 'Tis in vain for Mr. *Hill* to assert that this System is not Platonical, because *Justin* had renounced *Plato*'s Philosophy: I can tell him that that System is much more conform to that of *Plato*, than to Scripture; and in fact, it was laid aside in the Controversy with the *Arians*, who drew great advantages from it. Thus some other *Hypotheses* of the Ancients were rejected, as that of the Invisibility of the Father, and the Visibility of the Son.

In fine, let it be granted to Mr. *Hill*, that the Fathers of *Nice* have borrowed the Article, *Light of Light*, from the Platonists Notion, and that the Bishop of *Salisbury* does affirm it; pray where is the Crime of that? Was not the κύριε ἐλέησον borrowed from the Heathens? If this Notion which was common to Scripture, with the wisest Philosophy, could be usefully employed to denote that the Divine Essence is in the Father, and in the Son, as Light is of the same Nature in two Candles, one of which is lighted by the other; why should not they have made use of it? This is *Tatian*'s Notion, and the learned Dr. *Bull* believes

lieves that the Fathers of *Nice* have followed the ſame, *p.* 60. *Euſebius Cæſarienſis* drew the Scheme of the *Nicene* Creed; and it appears by his Book, *De Præparatione Evangelica*, how much ſtreſs he laid upon *Plato*'s Authority to eſtabliſh the Dogma of the Trinity. The Fathers of the Council added only to it the word ὁμοούσιον, which at firſt ſeemed hard to *Euſebius*, but he admitted it afterwards. This word ὁμοούσιον had been diſgraced by the abuſe that *Paulus Samoſathenus* made of it, having employed it to denote that Jeſus Chriſt was only of the ſame Nature with us: But the Fathers of *Nice* have uſed it to ſignify, that he was of the ſame Nature with the eternal Father. After this the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* have made uſe of it, in the firſt Senſe, to expreſs the Faith of the Church againſt the *Apollinarians* and *Eutichians*, who denied that Jeſus Chriſt had a Soul. No man has found fault with him for making that uſe of the word ὁμοούσιος. If *Euſebius Cæſarienſis* had not been the firſt Author of this Creed, Mr. *Hill*'s Objection would be of ſome force. But as it is certain, that the *Nicene* Fathers have uſed the Creed, drawn up by *Euſebius Cæſarienſis*, without adding any thing elſe to it, but the word ὁμοούσιον; and the Condemnation of *Arius*'s Propoſitions confirming the Condemnation pronounced before by *Alexander*; ſo it is viſible that they have made uſe of a Notion in it, which was received by thoſe Fathers that were Platoniſts: It ſeemed to them conſonant to the Chriſtian Faith; and we receive it at this Day, taking

it in a commodious Senſe; I ſay we take it in a large Senſe; for it is certain that this Expreſſion *Deus de Deo*, being as ſtrictly taken as Mr. *Hill* uſually takes words in Diſputing againſt the Biſhop, does rather denote the Subſtance than the Perſonality, as that of *Lumen de Lumine*; and when in pronouncing theſe words we refer them to the Perſonality, we have more regard to the Senſe of the Church, than to the natural Import and Signification of the Expreſſion; for we only mean that the Son is derived from the Father, who communicates the Divine Eſſence to him, and not that the Eſſence of the Father's Divinity produces ſuch another Eſſence in the Son.

Mr. *Hill* might very well have forborn his Cenſuring the Biſhop upon this Article of the Creed; for whatever pains he takes to deliver his Readers from this thought, that the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* have referred the Expreſſion *Deus de Deo*, *&* *Lumen de Lumine*, to the ſecond Generation, yet he himſelf furniſhes us with a ſufficient Argument to confute him, in the paſſages which he quotes in the Margin out of *Tertullian*, *Theophilus*, *Athenagoras*, *Juſtin* and *Tatian*. For the Fathers have uſed theſe Expreſſions with *Tertullian* againſt *Praxeas*, to denote the ſecond, but not the eternal Generation of the *Word*. *Tertullian* particularly called the ſecond Generation the true Nativity of the Word. What can a Reader conclude from thence, but that the Notion *Deus de Deo*, *&* *Lumen de Lumine*, in the Council of *Nice*, relates to this ſecond Generation? Which Mr. *Hill* himſelf calls an odd Conceit, *p.* 12. though he

affirms, *p.* 75. that the Church never condemned it: So that upon the whole Matter, it is very natural to believe that the Fathers of *Nice* took theſe words in the ſame Senſe in which they were taken by the Ancients.

Mr. *Hill* may ſee now of what uſe the Platonick Notions have been to explain the Doctrine of the Trinity. The learned confeſs that the νοῦς, or the λόγος of *Plato*, and his ψυχὴ, or δημιουργὸς have nothing common with the two laſt Perſons of the Trinity. This is not only acknowledged, but proved by the learned Dr. *Temiſon*, in the Book before cited. On the other hand, it's no leſs certain that the Ancients have made uſe of the Platonick Notions, upon the λόγος and δημιουργὸς, to ſhew that *Plato* owned the two laſt Perſons of the Trinity. What follows from all this, but that Mr. *Hill* might have ſpared his Cenſures againſt the Biſhop? And that notwithſtanding all his endeavours, all what he has ſaid to juſtify the Ancients, is uſeleſs and inſignificant.

I ſhall add but one word more upon this Head; *viz.* That it does not become Mr. *Hill* to find fault with the Biſhop for having aſſerted that the Fathers before the Council of *Nice* did conceive in the Trinity a Subordination, importing an inequality of the two laſt Perſons with the firſt: He will give himſelf a very needleſs trouble if he undertake to clear them from that. The Biſhop has but too many Proofs upon this Article; and none but thoſe who never read the Ancients, or read them without attention, can diſown it. This

is

is acknowledged by *Petavius*, Dr. *Cudworth*, and *Heurnius*, *Origen*, *lib.* 2. *q.* 2. By this kind of injudicious Accusations Mr. *Hill* would almost tempt a man to draw such a Picture of Antiquity, as would not be much to its advantage. We may say in a word, That if there have been some among the Ancients who have recommended the study of Pagan Authors, because of the use that a Christian might make of them, to render the Doctrines of his Religion more probable to the Heathens, there have been others who have almost absolutely condemned that study, seeing what impression Platonism had made in the Minds of the Primitive Christians; so that Pope *Gelasius* was in the right, in the *Roman* Council, when he ranked with prohibited Books the greatest part of those Authors who have spoken so crudely upon the point of the Trinity.

Mr. *Hill* proceeds to another Accusation, which is as ill grounded: He pretends that the Bishop has unjustly charged the Fathers with believing a specifick Unity of the Divine Essence, and with having understood the word ὁμοούσιον in that Sense, *p.* 91. and *seq.* Mr. *Hill* thinks this is to charge the Fathers with Tritheism, which he may with so much the more reason impute to the Bishop; that the Bishop supposing that the Fathers have attributed to the Persons Operations *ad extra*, different from each other; he is not only fallen himself into the same Notion, but which is more, he has insinuated, by his method, that he believes a *Tetras* in God, namely the Essence *in abstracto*, and the three Persons. I say this is a very ground-

leſs Accuſation; for it's true that there are but too many of the Ancients who have gone upon this Hypotheſis the Biſhop ſpeaks of, in explaining the Dogma of the Trinity. Mr. *Hill* may be informed of it by reading amongſt others Father *Petav. de S. Trinit. l. 6. c. 9.* The Learned Dr. *Cudworth* has ſaid as much as the Biſhop; theſe are his words, *Intellect. Syſt. p. 604.* "However it is evident "from hence, that theſe reputed Orthodox Fa- "thers, who were not a few, were far from think- "ing the three Hypoſtaſes of the Trinity to have "the ſame ſingular exiſtent Eſſence; they ſuppoſing "'em to have no otherwiſe one and the ſame Eſſence "of the Godhead in them, nor to be one God, "than three individual men have one common "ſpecifical Eſſence of Manhood in them, and are "all one Man. But as this Trinity came after- "wards to be decried for Tritheiſm; ſo in the "room thereof ſtarted thereup that other Trinity "of Perſons numerically the ſame, or having all "one and the ſame ſingular exiſtent Eſſence; a Do- "ctrine which ſeeemeth not to have been owned by "any publick Authority in the Chriſtian Church, "ſave that of the *Lateran* Council only.

I know there are ſome learned men, who, as Dr. *Bull*, have endeavoured to give a good Senſe to their Expreſſions, and by a long compaſs of Conſequences reduce them to the ordinary Notions. We cannot but commend their Zeal for Antiquity; but after all, it were expedient that thoſe who have the Opinions of the Fathers but at the ſecond hand, ſhould not be ſo poſitive in juſtifying all their Sentiments. Thoſe who are troubled

troubled at those failings with which the Fathers may be charged, ought to consider; *First*, That without examining Questions with great care, it is not possible to foresee all the Consequences that may be drawn from them. *Secondly*, That these Questions have risen one after another in process of time, and of many Disputes. *Thirdly*, That it easily happens, even to those who handle Matters with the greatest caution, to fall into Expressions, which being strictly taken, have a harsh Sense. *Fourthly*, That the Authority of some great men has often gained to them great numbers of Followers, concerning things which Posterity has justly condemned. *Fifthly*, That almost all the strayings of the Fathers do rise from thence; that in combating the Hereticks they departed from the simplicity of Scripture Expressions, and undertook to explain this Mystery by human Ideas very remote from the Truth.

But Mr. *Hill* tells us, The Bishop of *Sarisbury*, who imputes to the Fathers a sort of *Tritheism* by his Explanation, falls himself into the same Absurdity; nay, he establishes a kind of *Terras* in the Godhead, which is worse than *Tritheism*. This is a great Charge. In the Divine Essence, says the Bishop, there may be Three that may have a diversity of Operations as well as œconomies. Here is the heresy of these words, according to Mr. *Hill*, p. 98. Now, whatsoever acts by another, is distinct from that other by which it acts, if prior in the Agency, by the order of reason. Here we have indeed a special Hunter of Hereticks: I shall not answer him, that there have been

been divers Schoolmen who believed an abſolute Subſiſtence of the Divine Eſſence, beſides the three Subſiſtences, which make the Perſonalities, without acknowledging that *Tetras* that Mr. *Hill* ſpeaks of; the Biſhop, I am ſure, would not uſe this Apology; But I anſwer, That he offers a manifeſt violence to the Biſhop's words, that contains nothing but what is agreeable to the conſtant way of ſpeaking which Divines uſe concerning the Operations appropriated to each Perſon, without confounding them with the notional Expreſſions that ſerve to diſtinguiſh them. The Name of God ſometimes ſignifies his Eſſence, ſometimes the Three Perſons; and ſometimes it imports but One Perſon of the Trinity; do we therefore acknowledge a Quaternity? To draw ſuch conſequences as theſe in order to aſcribe Hereſies to thoſe who ſometimes uſe the Word GOD in one of theſe ſignifications, and ſometimes in another, is meer Sophiſtry. We ſay, That the Father is God, to denote his Divine Eſſence: We ſay, That God has created the World, to expreſs the common Work of the Trinity: We ſay, That God is incarnate, to ſignify the Union of the *Word* with Humanity. How many Hereſies might be imputed to Writers, if one would make ſuch Objections againſt them, and urge upon the word *God* Notions altogether foreign to the Subject in hand? But God be thanked, that all thoſe who write, are not of Mr. *Hill*'s temper.

Mr. *Hill* follows his blow; after he has reproached the Biſhop for repreſenting the Ancients as Tritheiſts, he accuſes him of maintaining that

thoſe

those who succeeded them, have used Notions that were little better, when they made use of that Notion of the Sun, with its Light and Heat; and of that of the Soul, from whence flows the Understanding and the Will, to express the Processions of the Trinity. Nay, he objects to him, that those who have supposed different Operations in the Two Persons, are, according to this System, as much Tritheists as the first. Mr. *Hill* affirms on the contrary, That these Notions of the Fathers which the Bishop rejects, have been used from the beginning; so that the Bishop ought not to have said, that the using of these Notions was only that the Fathers might get out of *Tritheism*. This is a very pitiful Accusation. It seems Mr. *Hill* did not understand the Bishop's meaning, when he says that the Emanation of the Son and Holy Ghost were expressed by the acts of Understanding and Will; he does not intend to deny, that this Notion was used in ancient Times, but only to condemn the boldness of the Schoolmen, who would almost make this way of explaining the Procession of the Persons, pass for an Article of Faith, namely, that the Son proceeds by the Understanding, and the Holy Ghost by the Will; tho very Eminent Divines have rejected these Definitions, as *Zanchius lib. 5. C. ultimo*, and *Durandus* refutes them in 1. *Dist. 6. q. 2.* As to what Mr. *Hill* fancies, that the Bishop is guilty of *Tritheism*, because he ascribes different Operations to the Two Persons; the poor man is visibly mistaken. Does not all Divines acknowledge different Operations of the Two Persons? Are they thereby infected with

Tritheism?

Tritheiſm? Or was St. *Paul* infected with Hereſy, when he ſaid, *There are diverſities of gifts, but the ſame ſpirit; there are differences of adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord; there are diverſities of operations, but it is the ſame God, who worketh all in all*, 1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6. I ſee what led Mr. *Hill* into this Error. He did imagine that, becauſe it is a Maxim in Divinity, that the Actions of the Trinity *ad extra*, are common to the Three Perſons, there are no Actions particularly belonging to One Perſon, according to the Oeconomy of the Three Perſons. But doubtleſs he makes a very ill uſe of this Maxim, which may hold with relation to the Acts that conſtitute the Three Perſons, and are proper to every one; for inſtance, the Act of Generation, which is proper to the Father excluſively of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; but this maxim does not hinder us from being firmly perſuaded, that it was the Son only who took upon him the form of a Servant in the ſingularity of his Perſon, and not in the Unity of the Divine Nature, in what was proper to the Son, and not in that which was common to the whole Trinity. This is diſtinctly expreſſed by the forged *Dyoniſius de div. Nom. c.* 2. &c. and approved in the ſixth General Council, Act 8. where his Authority is made uſe of, and it is alſo acknowledged by *Damaſc. lib.* 3. *de fide c.* 3. by *Elias Cretenſis* upon the fifth Oration of St. *Gregory*, and by *Nicetas de fid. Orthod. c.* 34. M. *Hill* ſhould have known beſides, that in the miſſion of the Perſons *ad extra*, the action by which they act upon a particular Subject is proper to them, and is common to the three Perſons only in reſpect to the Will; the acts of which are common to the three Perſons.

You

You ſee, Sir, how the Biſhop has fallen into the hands of a Man, who underſtands things only by halves. Mr. *Hill* is not pleaſed with the Biſhop's way of treating the Fathers, but he is yet more offended at the Explication and Notion which the Biſhop advances of the Doctrine of the Trinity: This is what the Biſhop ſays, *p.* 104. "We do plainly perceive in our ſelves two, if "not three Principles of Operation, that do not "only differ, as Underſtanding and Will, which "are only different modes of Thinking, but dif- "fer in their Character and way of Operation. "All our Cogitations and Reaſonings are a ſort "of Acts, in which we can reflect on the way "how we operate: We perceive that we Act "freely in them, and that we turn our Minds to "ſuch Objects and Thoughts as we pleaſe. But "by another Principle, of which we perceive no- "thing, and can reflect upon no part of it, we "live in our bodies, we animate and actuate them, "we receive ſenſations from them, and give mo- "tions to them, we live and dye, and do not "know how all this is done. It ſeems to be from "ſome emanation from our Souls, in which we do "not feel that we have any liberty, and ſo we "muſt conclude, that this Principle in us is Na- "tural and Neceſſary. In acts of Memory, Ima- "gination, and Diſcourſe, there ſeems to be a "mixture of both Principles, or a third that re- "ſults out of them. For we feel a freedom in one "reſpect, but as for thoſe marks that are in our "Brain, that ſet things in our Memory, or furniſh "us with words, we are neceſſary Agents; they

"come in our way, but we do not know how:
"We cannot call up a figure of things or words
"at pleaſure; ſome diſorder in our Mechaniſm
"hides or flattens them, which when it goes off,
"they ſtart up and ſerve us, but not by any act
"of our Underſtanding and Will. Thus we ſee,
"that in this ſingle undivided Eſſence of ours, there
"are different Principles of Operation, ſo different
"as Liberty and Neceſſity are from one another.
"I am far from thinking that this is a proper Ex-
"planation or Reſemblance of this Myſtery, yet it
"may be called, in ſome ſort, an Illuſtration of it;
"ſince it ſhews us from our own Compoſition,
"that in one Eſſence there may be ſuch different
"Principles, which in their proper Character
"may be brought to the terms of a contradiction,
"of being free and not free. So in the Divine
"Eſſence, which is the ſimpleſt and perfecteſt
"Unity, there may be three that may have a di-
"verſity of Operations, *&c.*

Mr. *Hill* thinks that this Notion is not leſs impertinent to explain the Trinity, than that of the Fathers; Thus he ſpeaks, *p.* 106. "This is a "worthy Simile indeed (to ſupplant that ſcouted "one of the Ancients) in which is no repreſentation "of the *Logos*, and its Parent Principle, nor of the "Spirit of Holineſs that is in the Father and the "Son, nor one of their Co-eſſentiality, Co-eter-"ternity or Order, all which are reſembled in "that Simile which this undermines. Then he Examins it particularly, and endeavours to ſhew many abſurdities in it. One may eaſily judge, that it is not hard for him to do this. If all the

Similies

Similies given of the Trinity, ought to expreſs all that we conceive of it, what Simile can we uſe? At this rate, how can we juſtifie that reſemblance uſed by *Athanaſius*, of the Root and the Branches, to give us an Idea of the Co-equality? And that other, of a Fountain, a River, and a Vapour. That which makes Mr. *Hill* to be ſo unfair a Critick, is, that he does not conſider, that Similies are uſed generally for one particular deſign. When a Divine would expreſs the Conſubſtantiality, he brings Reſemblances that ſerve only for his purpoſe, and he does not matter whether they explain the whole *Dogma* of the Trinity, or not. The Biſhop therefore was in the right, to uſe a Simile, which ſerved to prove what he deſigned to eſtabliſh, namely, that in a moſt ſimple Subſtance there may be various Principles of Operations. A Man muſt have but little judgment, to think that he was bound to ſeek for ſome of another nature. It's very obſervable, that St. *Auguſtine*, who has advanced more Similies than any of the Ancients, as you may ſee in his Books of the Trinity, from the ſixth to the fifteenth, which is the laſt, declares himſelf in the 15th Book, Chap. 7. that they are very imperfect and unlike, and that it's vain for us to ſeek in Created things, repreſentations of an incomprehenſible Myſtery. If the Biſhop has not made uſe of that Notion of the *Logos*, which ſignifies the Reaſon upon which *Baſil* and *Gregory* of *Nazianze* have inſiſted, it is becauſe he thinks that that Name is not ſo much given to the Second Perſon, becauſe he is the *Reaſon* of the Father, as becauſe

(according to those Divines who have more accurately Examin'd the Stile of Scripture.) St. *John* has respect in that word to the description of the Creation, and to the Ministery of the Messias, by which God did always express himself, according to the Hypothesis of the Ancients. But what would Mr. *Hill* say, if by ill luck it appeared, that what the Bishop has alledged to illustrate the Trinity, were the Notion of St. *Augustine* himself in his Books of the Trinity? And yet this might be easily proved, if it were worth our while. I confess Mr. *Hill* will find in the Ninth Book, that there, for a resemblance of the Trinity, he gives us Man Created after God's Image, in whom he finds a sort of Trinity, namely, a Mind, a Knowledge of himself, and a Love by which Man loves himself. But tho' this be Mr. *Hill*'s favourite Notion, and that of many Schoolmen, yet St. *Augustine* in his Tenth Book prefers another before it, which seems clearer to him, and more proper to explain the Idea's of the Trinity, that is Memory, Understanding, and Will. In fine, as if these Notions could not satisfie him, he borrows Similies from Brutes, Plants and Trees, from the inward Senses, from Learning and Wisdom, *&c.* And after all, he is forced to confess, that all these Representations cannot give us a perfect Idea of the Trinity. If we had some portion of Mr. *Hill*'s Criticising Spirit, here were a large field to shew many dissimilitudes in those Similies, but he who can give himself that trouble, must have little to do, and had need to have a very patient Reader to bear the tediousness of it.

We

We are come at last to Mr. *Hill's* System, which he opposes and prefers to that of the Bishop, as having nothing in it, but what is drawn both from Scripture and Antiquity. And first, I must give him his due, and acknowledge that he says many good and Orthodox things upon this matter. I agree with him, when he tells us, that he cannot conceive three Minds in God, without establishing Tritheism, *p.* 112. But he is absolutely mistaken, when he denies, that several of the Ancients have acknowledged three Minds in God. Mr. *Hill* may easily be convinced of this; he owns, *p.* 113. that to acknowledge three Minds in God, is by consequence to acknowledge three Substances; but nothing is more evident, than that most of the Fathers have acknowledged three Substances. This would be soon demonstrated, if I would insist upon the Expressions of the Fathers, who have followed *Plato's* Notions; for it's not the Father which the *Platonists* call νους, as Mr. *Hill* does, but it's the λογος which they call νους. Dr. *Cudworth*, *p.* 591. of his System, has given us the reason why the *Platonists* did so, by shewing, that they looked upon the Notion of νους, as inconsistent with the most simple Nature of the ἀγαθον, which they conceived as the source of the Deity, that was communicated to the νους or λογος. This may be seen in *Macrobius*, *lib.* 1. *in Somn. Scip.* C. 14. From whence it appears, that the *Platonists*, as Dr. *Cudworth*, and Dr. *Tenison* do agree, acknowledged three Substances in their Trinity. Mr. *Huet* owns as much, in his *Origeniana*, concerning those Divines who did,

did, like *Origen*, follow the Notions of *Plato*, to explain the Doctrine of the Trinity.

But we have yet more evident proofs of this
1. truth. 1. It is certain that the *Greeks*, before the Council of *Nice*, have conſtantly ſuppoſed that there were three Hypoſtaſes in the *Trinity*; and it's no leſs certain, than that by three Hypoſtaſes the *Greeks* underſtood three Subſtances. The thing is ſo unqueſtionable, that the Council of *Nice* uſes the words ὑπόστασις & οὐσία, for one and the ſame thing. I know that St. *Baſil* in his 78 Epiſtle, endeavours to give another ſenſe to theſe words of the Council, but we may juſtly oppoſe to him *Athanaſius*, who had been at the Council of *Nice*: For he expreſly affirms in his fifth Oration againſt the *Arians*, that the Father and the Son have but one Nature and Hypoſtaſis; he ſays the ſame in his Epiſtle to *Liberius*, and in that to the Biſhops of *Africk*, where he poſitively aſſerts that the Hypoſtaſis is the Nature. We may further oppoſe to St. *Baſil*, *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, who had been as it were the ſoul of the Council of *Nice*; for in his Letters, the one mentioned by *Theodoret*, and the other by *Socrates*, he takes conſtantly Hypoſtaſis for Eſſence. This we ſee likewiſe in the addition to the Synodical Epiſtle of the Fathers of *Sardica* in *Theodoret*, *Lib.* 2. *C.* 6. where they charge the *Arians* with believing three Hypoſtaſis, becauſe they believed three different Subſtances, that of the Father, that of the Son, and that of the Holy Ghoſt. The ſame may alſo be obſerved in the 57. Epiſtle of St. *Jerome*, which he writes to Pope *Damaſus*, where he maintains, that to ſay three Hypoſtaſes,

postases is the same as to say three Substances, and that all men speak so, when they will speak *Greek*.

That too many of the *Greek* Fathers, who have disputed against the *Sabellians*, have taken these words in this sense, is but too evident from the instance of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, Sirnamed the Great. This great Man is vindicated by *Athanasius*, as having never entertained any impious opinion about the *Trinity*. But St. *Basil* rejects him upon many Articles, chiefly where he confirms the *Arian* Heresie; if he defends him somewhere, it's only with this Apology, that while he too eagerly intends to confute the *Sabellians*, he falls into the contrary opinion; and besides, he accuses him of having impious Opinions concerning the Holy Ghost. *Phot. Cod.* 232. *pag.* 902. I have observed this concerning *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, 1. Because the *Arians* boasted that he was of their side. 2. Because *Alexander* of *Alexandria* follows some of his Expressions, in his Synodical Epistle to all the Bishops, when he accuses *Arius* of not believing the Son to be like the Father in respect of his Nature, and calls the Father and the Son δύο πεφύκοτα, just as *Origen* had done. 3. Because Mr. *Hill* has suffered himself to be imposed upon by a spurious piece, which he cites under the name of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, as truly his, but it's visibly false, since the Doctrine it contains is altogether contrary to what we know to have been the Doctrine of that Ancient Author.

2*ly*. It's certain that most of the Ancient Fathers, before the Council of *Nice*, have held a Generation 2.

of

of the *Word in tempore*, before the Creation of the World *. The Learned Dr. *Bull* has given us a long Liſt of them, and Mr. *Hill* owns it, calling this a *ſingularly odd notion*. It was the great Argument of the *Arians*, who concluded from thence that the Fathers had aſſerted that Jeſus Chriſt was of another Subſtance with the Father, as being made and created, which they proved by thoſe paſſages of the Fathers, where they uſe the words *made* and *created*. Now its certain, that *Alexander* of *Alexandria* does not ſerve himſelf of the Notion of this Generation *in tempore* before the Creation, to oppoſe the *Arians*, but urges only the Generation of the Son by the Father *ab æterno*, to prove that Jeſus Chriſt was not made before the World, and that he was Creator and not a Creature. In this ſenſe we ought to take the words of the *Nicene* Creed, which may juſtly be looked upon as the confirmation of *Alexander*'s Synodical Letter to all the Biſhops. This Remark is the more neceſſary, becauſe moſt of thoſe who have diſputed againſt the *Arians* after the Council of *Nice*, have abandoned the Syſtem of the Ancients, concerning the two Productions of the Λόγος, as *Alexander* had abandon'd it: This great man being it ſeems more uſed to this Controverſie, had found that this ſecond production gave mighty advantages to the *Arians*. If the Reader have a mind to know what thoſe advantages were, we may eaſily ſatisfie him. 1. The Fathers following ſome Texts of

* *Juſtin. M. Ap.* 2. *p.* 66. *E. Dial. cum Tryph. p.*285. *D.*358. *B.C.* 359. *B. Athenag. Legat. pro Chriſtianis, p.* 10. *D. Theophil. ad Autol. p.*88. *B. p.*100. *B. Tatian p.*145. *B. Clem. Alex. Strom.*5. *p.*553. *B.*591. *B. Strom.* 6. *p.*644. *A. Strom.* 7. *p.*700. *c. Tertull. Apol. c.*21. *p.*19. *contra Herm. c.* 3. *c.*18. 20. 45. *adv. Prax. c.*5. 7. 12. *Laſt. l.* 2. *c.* 8. *p.*177,178. *l.*4. *c.*6. *p.*364, 365. 366.

of Scripture, granted that the ſecond Nativity of the Son, would make him to be look'd upon as Created; it was in oppoſition to this that the Council defined, *genitum, & non factum.*

2. It gave occaſion to believe that the Son was not eternal, and that the Father had not been Father *ab æterno*, which did abſolutely deſtroy the Divinity of the Son.

3. It is to be obſerved, that *Origen* as well as *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, having been cited by the *Arians* as their great Author, to prove that the Son was begotten and made γέννητος καὶ γενητός, it was afterward defined, that the Son was γέννητος ἀμα καὶ ἀγέννητος, γέννητος in reſpect of the Eſſence, ἀγέννητος, becauſe he was not made; this is *Epiphanius*'s Obſervation againſt the *Origeniſts*, *Parag.* 8. where he accuſes *Origen* to have called the Son of God, γίνητον θεόν, *Deum factum.* See *Valeſ. ad Theodoret. Lib.* 2. *c.* 6.

4. It is evident, that tho ſome believe that the word ὁμοούσιος, which was uſed in the Council of *Nice*, denotes the Numerical Unity of the Divine Eſſence: Yet many of the Fathers have uſed it only to expreſs the ſame Specifical Eſſence. Dr. *Cudworth* has very well obſerved it, *Pag.* 611. upon a paſſage of *Epiphanius*, and another of *Athanaſius*. *Athanaſius* ſpeaks thus, οὐκ γὰρ πάππον φερονοῦμεν ὡς Σαβέλλιοι μονούσιον καὶ ἓν ὁμούσιον. *Expoſit. fid. p.* 241. *Epiphanius* makes the ſame remark, καὶ ὃ λέγομεν, ταυτούσιον ἵνα μὴ ἡ λέξις παρά τινι λεγομένη Σαβελλίων ἀπεικάσθη, ταὐτὸν δὲ λέγομεν ἢ θεότητι καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ δυνάμει, *H.* 76. *n.* 17. from whence Dr. *Cudworth* draws this Concluſion: "It's plain, that the Anci-

"cient Orthodox Fathers asserted no such thing, "as one and the same singular or numerical Es- "sence, of the several Persons of the Trinity, "this according to them being not a real Trinity, "but a Trinity of meer Names, Notions, and in- "adequate Conceptions only.

5. You ought to know, that the Fathers for the most part, have a Notion very frequent in their Writings, till St. *Augustin*'s Time, who did confute it, and obliged those by whom it was received, to reject it; which is, that the Father alone being of his own Nature invisible, the Apparitions of God mentioned in the Old Testament could not be ascribed to him, but that they must be referred only to the λόγος, as to him whom the Father has not only employed as a Minister in the Creation, but by whom also he always Revealed himself under the Old Testament. This may be seen in *Justin Martyr*, Dial. against *Tryph. p.* 275. *A.* 283. *B.* and 357. B. C. in *Tertullian* against *Praxeas*, *p.* 648. in *Novatian. lib. de Trinit.* Now this Notion, supposed that the Father and the Son were not of the same Nature; and without doubt, this was the reason why St. *Augustin* did reject and confute it, as appears in his Books of the Trinity.

Add *Theophilus l.* 2. *ad Autolycum*, *p.*100. *Tertul. adv. Jud. c.* 9. *p.*194. *adv. Marcion. l.* 2. *c.* 27. *p.*395,396. *Synodus Antiochena Concil. To.* 1. *Ed. Lab. To.*1.*p.*845 *D. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l.* 1. *c.* 2.

It were endless, to take notice of all those Expressions of the Fathers, which import a diversity of Substance; it's enough to have considered the most remarkable, out of the chief Authors, cited by Mr. *Hill* to confirm his System, such as *Origen*, and *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, Sirnamed the Great, who is especially famous for having opposed *Sabellianism*,

bellianism, to which I could add some passages out of *Clemens Alexandrinus* reported by *Photius*, *Cod.* 106. and out of *Theognostus* of *Alexandria*, mentioned by *Photius*, *Cod.* 106. I shall not take notice of those which relate to the Holy Ghost, of whom they speak meaner yet than of the λόγος. Mr. *Hill* may read what *Theognostus* says of him in *Photius*, *Cod.* 106. and *Lactantius* in his Institutions, and *Eusebius* against *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*; after this, let him say, if he dare, that the Fathers have constantly acknowledged but one Substance of the three Persons; and if they have not acknowledged this, with what Confidence did he impute to them an Opinion, which how true soever, is yet quite contrary to their Doctrine?

The second thing which may be Censured in Mr. *Hill*'s Hypothesis concerning the Trinity, is, that it accommodates the Scripture to the System of *Thomas Aquinas*. I have observed before, that the Scripture speaks of the λόγος, under another Notion, than that of *Reason*, which contains and judges of the Idea's that are in the mind. *Theophilact* is aware of this, upon the 1*st* of St. *John*, where he rejects that famous division of the λόγος into προφόρικον and ἐνδιάθετος, in disputing against Porphiry; and all the more Learned Divines do likewise acknowledge it; whereas *Thomas Aquinas*, to give a Reason why there are but three Persons in the Trinity, builds upon the two Faculties, of Understanding and Will, which we conceive in the Humane Soul. I confess, that St. *Augustine* may have given some occasion to the Schoolmen to frame that System, and to apply it to the

Words of Scripture, which ſpeak of the Trinity. But upon this, I have three things to obſerve againſt Mr. *Hill*. 1. That tho' the Doctrine of the Trinity is clearly explained in Scripture, as to the ὅτι; yet there are ſuch difficulties about the διότι, that it were by much the wiſeſt thing to ſpeak of it only in Scripture words. This was the Maxim of *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, in his Letter to *Alexander* of *Byzantium*; where he ſays, that *St. John* has concealed the generation of the λόγος, becauſe it is incomprehenſible to Men and Angels, and that one cannot without Impiety dive into this Myſtery. *Ireneus* hath a whole Chapter to prove *Generationem ejus inenarrabilem eſſe*, in which he ſpeaks to the Hereticks in words as put againſt the Schoolmen, *vos autem Generationem ejus ex Patre divinantes, & verbi hominum per linguam factam prolationem transferentes in verbum Dei juſte delegimini a nobis. Et addimus ſi quis itaque nobis dixerit, quomodo ergo filius prolatus a Patre eſſe, dicimus ei quia prolationem iſtam ſive Generationem, ſive nuncupationem, ſive adapertionem, aut quomodolibet, quis nomine vocaverit Generationem ejus inenarrabilem exiſtentem, nemo novit niſi ſolus qui generavit, Pater, & qui natus eſt Filius*, &c. This was alſo the Maxim of St. *Baſil*, in his ſecond Book againſt *Eunomius*, *p.* 44. where he affirms, that we ought not to aſcribe any thing to the Son, but what is expreſly attributed to him in Scripture; and that we ought not to ſpeak of God, but in Scripture Terms, this is repeated in his Book *de vera fide*, *p.* 250. It was alſo the Notion of *Gregory* of *Nazianze*, *Orat.* 12. *p.* 204. Where he ſays, that the Trinity alone comprehends, *quo ordine erga ſe ſit.* In his thirteenth Oration, *p.* 211. and in 23. he declares

declares, that if he were asked the *Modus* of the Eternal Generation and Proceſſion, he would leave it to them who alone know themſelves, according to the Teſtimony of Scripture. *In divinis ſcientia ſua ignorantia maxima ſcientia.*

The ſecond thing is, that ſince the Fathers acknowledge, that the Myſtery of the Trinity is unknown to us, and even to the Angelical Beings, it were very prudently done, never to engage our ſelves into thoſe Explanations, much leſs to deliver them with an Authority almoſt equal to that of Scripture. This is the Judgment of St. *Gregory*, Sirnamed the Divine, in his *12th Orat.* For after all, to what purpoſe are all thoſe Similies uſed in this caſe? Since the ſame *Gregory* owns, that after having ſearched curiouſly for ſome reſemblance of the Trinity, he could never meet with any, that was able to ſatisfie him; ſo that he frankly declares, that that of the Eye, that of a Fountain and a River, that of the Sun, the Beams and the Light, or any other whatſoever, were not proper Images of the Myſtery of the Trinity. *Orat.* 37. *p.* 611.

The third thing which may be blamed in Mr. *Hill*'s Hypotheſis, wherein he has blended the Notions of the *Thomiſts* with thoſe of Scripture, is that it is not liked even by a great part of thoſe of the Church of *Rome*: For the *Scotiſts* make great Exceptions againſt it, and the difficulties which they urge againſt the *Thomiſts*, ſerve at beſt to render this matter more obſcure and intricate. All their working to prove that there cannot be more than three Perſons in the Divine Eſſence, ſeems to me as ſolid, as what *Ireneus* ſays, that there could not

not have been more than four Gospels, *Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 11. *Grotius* does some-where very much commend the way of the Patriarch *Gennadius*, in explaining the Doctrine of the *Trinity* in his Confession of Faith, which he presented to the Emperor *Mahomet* II. And indeed it is very commendable; and it were to be wished that those many Divines who are so positive, would imitate the modesty of it, in explaining those great Truths which the Scripture proposes to us, that we may receive them with submission of Faith, and not pry into them, and give Systems of 'em, in which upon examination it appears, that Humane Reason has a greater share than Divine Revelation.

It is not my design at present to examine more particularly Mr. *Hill*'s Hypothesis concerning the *Trinity*: A Learned Reader can easily see that he has compiled Dr. *Bull*. But it were to be wished,

1. That he had quoted the Fathers with a little more judgment, and cited only those that made for him; for that way of quoting Authors in a lump, is easie enough, and may impose upon those who never conversed with Antiquity; but it does very little honour to a Writer among those who are true Judges: I am sure, that if a man who is not a Scholar, would compare Mr. *Hill*'s Citations, with what he reads in *English* of the Doctrine of those Fathers, in the Ecclesiastical *Bibliotheque* of Mr. *Dupin*, a Doctor of *Sorbonne*, he would be strangely surprized to see that Mr. *Hill* cites for his Opinion a great number of Authors who are Diametrically opposite to him. But if Mr. *Hill* was to undergo the Censure of the Learned, who have

have studied these matters in the Originals, he has laid himself open to a very heavy one.

The 2*d* thing to be wished, is that Mr. *Hill* had not inspired his Readers with so profound a Veneration for Antiquity: It seems he has had the ordinary fate of those who dispute with too much heat; thinking that the Bishop rejected Antiquity with too great a contempt, he seems on the contrary to acknowledge the Authority of the Ancients as a Tradition almost infallible. If he is read in Antiquity, as he would fain perswade us he is, then he must be given over as a man past Cure, since his own reading could not bring him to have true and right notions concerning the Authority of the Ancients; but if he never read the Fathers, but relies upon the Extracts of others, I desire him to be a little better acquainted with the Ancient Doctors, before he presume to impose upon his Readers that blind Veneration for Antiquity, which he prescribes to them. Tho most of the Fathers from the middle of the second Century to the Council of *Nice*, had been engaged in Opinions contrary to the right notion we have of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as *Petavius* confesses it; this would make no impression upon me, since those Fathers did acknowledge the Authority of Scripture, from whence I may immediately derive the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; I say this would not make me doubt of the revealed Doctrine. Nay, more than that, I say that tho the whole Council of *Nice* had followed the opinion of those Fathers, it would not much move me; they were men, and liable to be mistaken, and those who can deny this truth

truth had as good renounce their Reformation all at once. Mr. *Hill* muſt remember what St. *Hierom* ſaith upon this very Queſtion, in his Apology againſt *Ruſinus*: *Et quomodo, (ô* Rufine) *inquies, in libris eccleſiaſticorum ſcriptorum vitia nonnulla ſunt? Si Cauſas vitiorum neſcire reſpondero, non ſtatim illos hæreticos indicabo; fieri enim poteſt ut vel ſimpliciter erraverint, vel alio ſenſu ſcripſerint, vel a librariis imperitis eorum paulatim ſcripta corrupta ſint, vel certè, antequam in Alexandria quaſi Dæmonium Meridianum Arius naſceretur, innocentès quædam & minus cautè locuti ſint, & quæ non poſſint perverſorum hominum calumniam declinare.*

This is what I had to ſay upon the Vindication of the Fathers undertaken by *Mr. Hill*, and upon the Syſtem which he oppoſes to the falſe Notions he aſcribes to the Biſhop of *Salisbury*. You ſee that the Fathers had need of another Apologiſt, eſpecially, ſince by the way he was pleaſed,

1. To give a wipe to *Tertullian*, the firſt in his opinion who defended the Doctrine of the *Trinity* againſt *Praxeas*; he ſays that his words and his ſenſe are ſometimes very ſingularly odd concerning the Production of the Second Perſon: And yet it's very obſervable, that *Tertullian* ſays nothing, but what has been advanced by many other Eccleſiaſtical Writers before the Council of *Nice*; ſo that, notwithſtanding all Dr. *Bull*'s Endeavours to reduce what theſe Fathers ſay to an Orthodox ſenſe, *Mr. Hill* muſt of neceſſity involve them in the ſame cenſure with *Tertullian*.

2*ly*. Mr. *Hill* affirms concerning the Fathers, that in his opinion they generally taught a gra-

cious

cious Adoption, and a Metaphorical Θεοποιοις of our Nature in Jesus Christ, and of all the Saints by him. But to justifie them in this Particular, we must say either, that Mr. *Hill* never read them, or that if he did, he quarrels with them with as little ground, as when he censures the Bishop for using the Expression of Divine Person in speaking of the Flesh; for both the Bishop and the Fathers, who often call Jesus Christ the Θεοφορος, have had the same Idea, so that they must either stand or fall together. But I shall take leave of this unfair Writer, when I have performed one thing that I promised.

I told you that I was very much surprized to find in Mr. *Hills* Book a most dangerous Principle, I must now make you sensible of it.

These are his words, *Pag. 6.* "What I "require, is, that the Catholick Doctrine "be asserted as a Rule of Faith, which the "Church is bound to adhere to on the "certain Authority of Divine Revelation; "this Revelation appearing real, not only "to particular mens private Opinions, but "originally committed to the charge and "custody of the whole Church by the Apo-"stles; and so preserved by their Succes-

" ſors throughout the whole diffuſive body;
" Whereas his Lordſhip only lays down
" this notion or form of Faith: That we
" believe Points of Doctrine, becauſe we
" are perſwaded that they are revealed to
" us in Scripture; which is ſo languid and
" unſafe a Rule, that it will reſolve Faith
" into every man's private Fancies and
" Contradictory Opinions: Since each man's
" Faith is his Perſwaſion, that what he
" believes for a Doctrine is revealed in
" Scripture. Whereas the act of a Chriſtian
" Faith believes ſuch Doctrine to be true
" and fundamental in Chriſtianity from the
" certain evidence thereof in the Scriptures,
" acknowledged by all Churches not led by
" caſual perſwaſions, but by a Primitive,
" perpetual, univerſal and unanimous Con-
" viction and Tradition. The deviation
" from which Rule and Notion, to private
" Opinions and Perſwaſions, is the cauſe
" of all Hereſies, and, by its conſequent di-
" viſions, naturally tends to the ruine of the
" True Chriſtian and Catholick Faith.

You ſee that Mr. *Hill* is angry with the Biſhop, for ſaying that we believe Points of Doctrine, becauſe we are perſwaded that they are revealed in Scripture; he thinks the Biſhop ſhould have ſaid, that we receive a Doctrine for fundamental, from the

the evidence thereof in the Scriptures, acknowledged by all Churches, not led by casual perswasions, *&c.* These Expressions are so intricate, that it's hard to guess at Mr. *Hill*'s meaning. If these words, acknowledged by all Churches, relate to the word *Scripture*, which goes immediately before, it's very hard to apply what he says to all the Books of Scripture, so as that they may retain their Authority with Christians; for it is notorious, that divers Books of Scripture, as the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, &c. have not that Primitive, Universal, and unanimous Tradition to establish their Authority. This one Clause of Mr. *Hill*'s will deprive us, at one dash, of all the Books, the Authority whereof we are told, in *Eusebius*'s Ecclesiastical History, was for a long time questioned by great Churches. But if he refers the words, acknowledged by all Churches, *&c.* to the evidence of Fundamental Doctrines, as the series of his Discourse, the Maxim of *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, which he cites, and what he says concerning the Creeds, seem to intimate, then this Proposition is not less dangerous than the other.

It is true, that a Fundamental Doctrine, the Revelation whereof is acknowledged by all the Churches, is most evident by that

very thing, that all the World does acknowledge it. But must therefore all the Fundamental Doctrines, which have not been acknowledged by all the Churches, tho they are clearly revealed in Scripture, be thought not fundamental, because they want this Evidence?

I confess *Mr. Hill* says, that he will not examine what Rules private men are to follow; but he affirms, that those who desire to arrive at a ripeness of Judgment and Knowledge, ought to take the Rule of *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, p. 7. which the Bishop has rejected.

But this, I say first of all, is a Notion that has no solid ground in Divinity: 'Tis granted, that Certainty of Revelation, in respect to those who live now, depends upon the Certainty of Revelation which the Apostolical, and after it the Christian Church, has had down to this time. But it is not a wild imagination, to oppose that Certainty which the Apostolical Church in a Body has had, to the perswasion of each Member of the Apostolical Church? What Certainty could the Body of the Apostolical Church have, but the Certainty which each single member of which it was composed had? Who ever heard, among Protestants, but

that the Faith of each private man reſolves it ſelf into the Certainty of Revelation, which way ſoever he may come by that Certainty of Revelation?

Is it not rank Popery to aſſert, that our Faith is not immediately reſolved into the Authority of God, who propoſes a Doctrine to us in Scripture? Pray where ſhall we find Chriſtians, if to be ſo, it is not enough to believe a Doctrine becauſe Chriſt has revealed it; but one muſt believe beſides, ſuch a Doctrine to be true and fundamental in Chriſtianity, from its certain evidence in Scripture, acknowledged by all Churches not led by caſual perſwaſions, but by a Primitive, perpetual, univerſal and unanimous Conviction and Tradition?

One might perhaps think at firſt, that this addition to the definition of Faith were no great matter; but I aſſure you, Sir, it deſtroys entirely the nature of Faith, and contains the whole Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* upon this Point; it imports that the Goſpel has no Authority, *quo ad nos*, till it is vouched by the Authority of the Church. The Church has been believed hitherto to be the Depoſitary of Scripture. But it was never believed that her Authority went ſo far, as that we ought not to receive a truth evident

evident in Revelation, but as it is acknowledged by all the Churches not led by caſual perſwaſions, but by a Primitive, perpetual, univerſal and unanimous Conviction and Tradition.

Indeed, Sir, if what Mr. *Hill* lays down be true, it's hard to tell who has Faith now? I deſire Mr. *Hill* to reflect upon that Article of the Creed, which eſtabliſhes the Proceſſion, *ab utroque*, and to tell me whether he does not think himſelf bound to believe it, till he has examined whether this is acknowledged by all the Churches not led by caſual perſwaſions, but by a Primitive, perpetual, univerſal and unanimous Conviction and Tradition? It is ſomewhat ſtrange, to ſee a Proteſtant uſe that as a neceſſary Character to eſtabliſh Faith, which the Papiſts employ to deſtroy it? The Papiſt thinks to have driven the Proteſtant to the impoſſibility of ſhewing how Faith is produced in a man who reads the Scripture, becauſe ſuch a man can't be ſure whether his being perſuaded by Revelation of ſome Fundamental Truth, is a ground he may ſafely rely upon, before he has Examined whether all the Churches agree upon that point, that ſeems to be Revealed, or not. And Mr. *Hill*, it ſeems, being not ſatisfied with what we anſwer to this Objection, thinks fit to ſide with

with the Papiſt. How edifying this proceeding can be, let Divines judge.

Pray, Sir, tell me what you think of this, when you hear it ſaid, that Faith has been ſo intruſted to the Cuſtody of the whole Church by the Apoſtles, that it was preſerved by the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles? "But "what I require, ſays Mr. *Hill*, is, that the "Catholick Doctrine be aſſerted as a Rule "of Faith, which the Church is bound to "adhere to, on the certain Authority of Di-"vine Revelation; this Revelation appear-"ing real, not only to particular Mens "private Opinions, but originally commit-"ted to the charge and cuſtody of the "whole Church by the Apoſtles, and ſo "preſerved by their Succeſſors, throughout "the whole diffuſive body, *p. 6.* Does Faith then depend upon the knowledge of the Apoſtles Succeſſors, or their faithfulneſs or unfaithfulneſs in keeping this Sacred Depoſitum? This puts me in mind of what *Vaſquez* ſays, that the Faith of a Chriſtian does ſo abſolutely depend upon the Authority of his Leaders, that if at this day a Heathen being caſt by a ſtorm into *England*, did embrace the Belief of our Church, which rejects Tranſubſtantiation, he would be in a ſtate of Salvation; tho' the Church of *Rome*, which alledges Tradition for this *Dogma*,

and

and has it in her Creed, declares that one can't be Saved without profeſſing that monſtrous Doctrine.

I know St. *Auguſtine* has ſaid, *non crederem Evangelio niſi me moveret Eccleſiæ Authoritas*; it ſeems Mr. *Hill* was deceived by this Maxim, which the Papiſts have adopted after they had corrupted it: For St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks only of the Miniſtery of the Church, in propoſing the Goſpels as written by Authors Divinely Inſpired. This was well obſerved by *Melchior Canus*, *lib. 2. c.* 8. The ſame Miniſtry may be attributed to the Church, with relation to the Creeds that it propoſes to us, as a faithful Abridgment of the Apoſtles Doctrine; but it is ridiculous to imagine, that we cannot produce an Act of Chriſtian Faith, without knowing the general conſent of all the Churches in profeſſing the ſame Truths. It is not the conſent of the Church, that makes a Doctrine either true or fundamental, the Nature of the Doctrine it ſelf makes it ſo. A Divine, who has pored long upon Antiquity, may by an exact ſtudy and meditation, have informed himſelf of that conſent; but this ſerves more for his particular Inſtruction, and for the confirmation of his own Theological Notions, concerning the diſtinction of Points fundamental, from Points that are not fundamental,

mental, than to confirm his Faith as he is a Chriſtian.

Mr. *Hill* makes a ſtrange uſe of the Maxim of *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*, *quod ubique, quod ſemper, quod ab omnibus*, &c. That Prieſt was a *Semipelagian*, that is, he thought that a Man could believe by his own ſtrength, and that afterward God gave him Grace to Execute his Good and Pious Reſolutions. He introduced this Maxim merely in oppoſition to St. *Auguſtine*, who pretended to have found his Doctrine concerning Grace in St. *Paul's* Epiſtles; ſo that this Father was obliged, either to confute the Fathers, or to abandon his Doctrine, which he had cauſed to be Authoriſed by the Councils of *Africa*. After all, he confeſſes himſelf, that his Method could only be of uſe againſt new-born Hereſies, ſuch as he pretended St. *Auguſtine*'s Doctrine to be. There is nothing more eaſie, ſays Mr. *Hill*, than for us to be informed of the Belief of Antiquity. I confeſs, we have their Symbols and Summaries of Faith, but Symbols have

no Authority, but as they are extracted from Scripture; this our Articles expreſly tell us. And the Apoſtles Creed, as we call it, was never known in the *Eaſt*, till within theſe few Centuries. What I have before mentioned upon the Article of the Proceſſion, *ab utroque*, ſhews that Mr. *Hill* has confounded what belongs to a Chriſtian, with what belongs only to Divines.

However, Mr. *Hill* grants, that Faith cannot be produced in a Man's Heart, but as far as he himſelf is perſuaded of the Truth of what he believes: But what he adds is extream raſh, when he aſſures us, that he, who cannot be perſuaded to receive the common and eſtabliſhed Syſtems of the Faith of the Univerſal Church, upon the Authority of which, it always ſtood and ſtands to this day, or frames fundamental Principles upon his own private Opinion, does not belong to the Communion of Chriſt's Church, tho' he fancies his Notions to be Revealed in Scripture.

I grant what Mr. *Hill* lays down, as to those who advance fundamental Articles upon their private Opinion; he seems thereby to reject the Articles which the Papists have introduced into the Creed, framed by *Pius* the fourth; but he can aſcribe no other Authority to Confeſſions of Faith or Symbols, but that which they borrow from their Conformity with Revelation the ſumm of which they contain. What he affirms, that the Catholick Church has always ſtood upon the Authority of Symbols, is a meer Viſion; the Church indeed made an Abſtract of Faith, for the uſe of *Cathecumenes*, which we call the *Creed*; ſhe taught it to thoſe *Cathecumenes*, as an Abridgment of what's Revealed; the Faith therefore of *Cathecumenes*, has an immediate reſpect to Revelation; it muſt rely and be founded upon that, if it be true. In a word, Mr. *Hill*, either becauſe he does not underſtand the matter, or out of a deſire to cenſure and contradict the Biſhop, explains his Opinion after a very odd manner, his Expreſſions do very much fa-

vour the Church of *Rome*, and are far from being ſo exact as a Cenſor ought to be; he ſhews that he himſelf ſtands in need of a great deal of Indulgence and Chriſtian forbearance.

I wiſh from my Heart he may come to himſelf, conſider his fault, and repent. If he could but for a minute reflect in cool blood, upon his outragious way of writing, and upon the Service that he has done to the Enemies of the Trinity, by endeavouring to ſacrifice to them one of the Defenders of it, for whoſe Talents he cannot but expreſs ſome eſteem, how averſe ſoever he may be to his Perſon, I am ſure he would be aſhamed of his Book. For notwithſtanding all his Paſſion, I am willing to believe, that the Chriſtian Spirit is not altogether extinguiſhed in him. I would have him conſider, that in the ſight of God, 'tis not he that receives, but he that does the Injury, that is Unhappy.

If I have chanced in this Paper, to ſay any

any thing that ſeems too ſevere againſt him, and that approaches too near to his Angry Strain, I humbly deſire, that without more ado, you would ſtrike it out, as being writ againſt my intention. I would by no means be my ſelf guilty of a fault, which I ſincerely lament when I find it in others, and which would but cover me with the more confuſion, if I ſhould be found to practiſe that which I condemn in another.

April 12. 1695. I am, Sir, *&c.*

FINIS.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell *at the* Roſe *and* Crown *in St.* Paul's *Church-Yard.*

A Diſcourſe of the Paſtoral Care. By the Right Reverend *GILBERT* Lord Biſhop of *Sarum.*

——His Four Diſcourſes delivered to the Clergy of the Diocels of *Sarum:* Concerning, I. The Truth of the Chriſtian Religion. II. The Divinity and Death of Chriſt. III. The Infallibility and Authority of the Church. IV. The Obligations to continue in the Communion of the Church. *8vo.*

Memoirs of the moſt Reverend *THOMAS CRANMER,* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury:* Wherein the Hiſtory of the Church, and the Reformation of it, during the Primacy of the ſaid Archbiſhop, are greatly illuſtrated, and many ſingular Matters relating thereunto, now firſt publiſhed. In Three Books. Collected chiefly from Records, Regiſters, Authentick Letters, and other Original Manuſcripts. By *John Strype,* M. A. *Fol.*

Origo Legum: Or, A Treatiſe of the Origine of Laws, and their Obliging Power; as alſo of their great Variety, and why ſome Laws are immutable, and ſome not, but may ſuffer change, or ceaſe to be, or be ſuſpended, or abrogated. In Seven Books. By *George Dawſon. Fol.* 1694.

A brief Diſcourſe concerning the Lawfulneſs of Worſhipping God by the Common-Prayer; in Anſwer to a Book, intituled, [*A Brief Diſcourſe of the Unlawfulneſs of Common-Prayer-Worſhip.*] By *John Williams,* D.D. *4to.* 1694.

Dr. *John Conant's* Sermons, Publiſh'd by Dr. *Williams,* 1693. *8vo.*

Ruſhworth's Hiſtorical Collections. The Third Part, in Two Volumes. Containing the Principal Matters which happened from the meeting of the Parliament, *Nov.* 3. 1640. to the end of the Year 1644. Wherein is a particular Account of the Riſe and Progreſs of the Civil War, to that Period. *Fol.* 1692.

The Hiſtory of the Troubles and Tryal of the Moſt Reverend Father in God *WILLIAM LAUD,* Lord Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*; Wrote by himſelf, during his Impriſonment in the *Tower.* To which is prefixed the Diary of his own Life, faithfully and entirely publiſhed from the Original Copy. And ſubjoyned a Supplement to the preceding Hiſtory; the Arch-Biſhop's Laſt Will: His Large Anſwer to the Lord *Say's* Speech concerning Liturgies: His Annual Accounts of his Province deliver'd to the King

King, and some other Things relating to the History. Published by *Henry Wharton*, Chaplain to Archbishop *Sancroft*. And by his Grace's Command. 8vo.

A Commentary on the First Book of *Moses*, called *Genesis*. By the Right Reverend Father in God, *Simon* Lord Bishop of *Ely*. 4to. 1693.

The Hearts-Ease; or, a Remedy against all Troubles. With a Consolatory Discourse, particularly directed to those who have lost their Friends and Relations. To which is added two Papers, printed in the time of the late Plague. By the same Author 12mo. (*Reprinted.*)

A Discourse Of the Government of the Thoughts. By *Fra. Tilly*, Sub-Dean of *York*. The Second Edition. 8vo.

The Bishop of *Sarum's* Sermon at the Funeral of Archbishop *Tillotson*, Who dyed in *Lambeth*, Nov. 26. 1694.

A Sermon concerning Holy Resolution, Preached before the King at *Kensington*: *Decemb.* 30. 1694. By his Grace Dr. *Thomas Tenison*, Lord Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*.

——His Sermon at the Funeral of the Queen, in the *Abby-Church* in *Westminster*: *March* 5. 1694.

Historia de Episcopis & Decanis Londinensibus necnon de Episcopis & Decanis Assavensibus à primaSedis utriusque fundatione ad Annum MDXL. *Accessit. Appendix instrumentorum quorundam insignium duplex. Autore* Henrico Whartono, *A. M.* 8vo. 1695.

The Possibility and Expediency and Necessity of Divine Revelation. A Sermon preach'd at St. *Martin's in the Fields*, January 7. 169⅝. at the beginning of the Lecture for the ensuing Year, Founded by the Honourable *Rob. Boyle* Esq; by *John Williams*, D. D.

——*The Certainty of Divine Revelation*, being his Second Sermon preach'd at the said Lecture, *Feb.* 4. 1695.

——His Vindication of the Sermons of his Grace *John* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, concerning the *Divinity and Incarnation of our Blessed Saviour*, and of the *Lord Bishop of Worcester's* Sermon on the *Mysteries of the Christian Faith*, from the Exceptions of a late *Socinian Book*, Intituled, [*Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity.*] To which is annexed a Letter from the *Lord Bishop of Sarum*, to the Author of the said *Vindication*, on the same Subject. 1695. 4to.

An Essay on the Memory of the late QUEEN. By *Gilbert* Bishop of *Sarum*. 8vo.

Remarks of an University Man upon a late Book, falsly called, [*A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, against the Imputations of* Gilbert *Lord Bishop of* Sarum, *Written by Mr.* Hill *of* Kilmington.] 4to. 1695.

The Characters of Divine Revelation. A Sermon Preached at St. *Martin's in the Fields*, *March* 4. 169⅝. Being the Third of the

the Lecture for the ensuing Year, founded by the Honourable *Robert Boyle*, Esquire. By *John Williams*, D. D.

Of Sincerity and constancy in the Faith and Profession of the True Religion, in several Sermons. By the most Reverend Dr. *John Tillotson*, late Lord Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. Published from the Originals, by *Ralph Barker*. D. D. Chaplain to his Grace. 8vo. 1695.

Advertisement.

THere will be published several other Sermons and Discourses of the most Reverend Dr. *JOHN TILLOTSON*, late Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*, by order of his Administratrix, faithfully transcribed from his own Papers, by Dr. *Ralph Barker* Chaplain to his Grace. Which are disposed of to *Richard Chiswell* and his Assigns. If any Person Print any others (except those published in the Author's Life-time) they are to be look'd upon as Spurious and False. And the Publishers will be proceeded against according to Law.